

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/763,394	07/02/2001	Shinichi Sugihara	564131/0016	5266	
7:	590 02/11/2003				
Stroock & Stroock & Lavan			EXAMINER		
180 Maiden Lane New York, NY 10038			JOHNSON, E	JOHNSON, EDWARD M	
			, ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1754	1 0	
			DATE MAILED: 02/11/2003	1 9	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/763,394	SUGIHARA, SHINI	СНІ
navisory nodon	Examiner	Art Unit	Ţ
	Edward M. Johnson	1754	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with	the correspondence add	dress
THE REPLY FILED 03 February 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to averinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	roid abandonment of this ap a timely filed amendment v	plication. A proper rep which places the application	ly to a ation in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the fee to the first period of the control of the contro	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set tater than SIX MONTHS from the number of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS of date on which the petition under 3 of extension and the corresponding the shortened statutory period for the later than three months after the	nailing date of the final reject OF THE FINAL REJECTION. 17 CFR 1.136(a) and the app 1 amount of the fee. The app 1 reply originally set in the fina	tion See MPEP ropriate extension propriate extension I Office action; or
1.⊠ A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>03 February 2003</u> . A 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	Appellant's Brief must be file R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismiss		forth in
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be			
(a) ☑ they raise new issues that would require furthe		ch (see NOTE below);	
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	•		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by n	naterially reducing or si	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number	of finally rejected claim	ıs.
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .			
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	on(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in	a separate, timely filed	amendment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: See		onsidered but does NC	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLE	LY to issues which wer	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendments explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 40-73.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 74-87.			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a	a) approved or b) dis	sapproved by the Exam	iner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	it(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	
10. Other:			



Continuation of 2. NOTE: The proposed amendment would add the recitation "titanium dioxide having... of 1.99 or lower" to the instant independent claims, which along with dependencies would create combinations of subject matter not previously claimed, which would be new issue requiring further search and/or consideration.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: It is argued throughout that the claims are allowable because the subject matter added in the after-final amendment is not disclosed. This is not persuasive because, even if true, th after-final amendment has not yet been entered. It is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the features of the after-final amendment) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Period (1981)